



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/712,232

11/12/2003

Marko Torma

KOLS.061PA

9486

7590 07/29/2008
Hollingsworth & Funk, LLC
Suite 125
8009 34th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55425

EXAMINER

BIAGINI, CHRISTOPHER D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/29/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/712,232	Applicant(s) TORMA, MARKO	
	Examiner Christopher Biagini	Art Unit 2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-31 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made.

The Examiner notes that, in accordance with the arguments presented by Applicant and MPEP 2111.01, the terms "sync server" and "client" in the claims will be interpreted according to the definitions supplied in paragraph [0011] of the Specification (i.e., a "SyncML synchronization server defined in the SyncML standard" and a "SyncML" client, respectively).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The claims are directed to a "computer program product" comprising only "program code portions." Software *per se*, absent a structurally and functionally interrelated computer-readable medium, is not statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8-11, 13, 15-20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the SyncML Sync Protocol Specification, version 1.0 (hereinafter "the SyncML specification") in view of Hillyard (US Publication No. 2003/0027526).

Regarding claim 1, note that the preamble has been given patentable weight as it is relied upon by the body of the claim (see "the first synchronization session" on line 5).

The SyncML specification shows a method for synchronization sessions between a first synchronization device and a second synchronization device (comprising the devices implementing the SyncML roles, such as a mobile phone and a server: see section 1.2 on page 7), wherein a first synchronization session is set up between the first synchronization device and the second synchronization device (see section 4 on page 25).

The SyncML specification does not show:

- defining automatically based on the first synchronization session and storing role information on the first synchronization device, which indicates whether the first synchronization device should serve as a client or a sync server in at least one subsequent synchronization session,

- checking said role information for the first synchronization device in response to a need for initiating a second synchronization session between the first synchronization device and the second synchronization device, and
- initiating the second synchronization session from the first synchronization device in accordance with said role information.

Hillyard shows:

- defining automatically based on a first session (comprising the session which first establishes a link) and storing role information (comprising client/server role information: see paragraph [0039] and [0057]-[0058]) on a first device, which indicates whether the first device should serve as a client or a server in at least one subsequent session (see paragraph [0054]),
- checking said role information for the first device in response to a need for initiating a second session between the first device and the second device (comprising determining if role information is stored and the nature of the role information: see paragraph [0055]), and
- initiating the second session from the first device in accordance with said role information (see paragraph [0055]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system described in the SyncML specification to use the client/server negotiation taught by Hillyard. Such an arrangement would allow SyncML devices that are peers (that is, devices for which there are no clear, pre-configurable choices for client and server) to successfully connect. See Hillyard, paragraphs [0013]-[0014].

Regarding claim 3, the combination further shows wherein a client initialization message for initiating the first synchronization session is transmitted from the first synchronization device to the second synchronization device (comprising client inquiries, which are sent periodically: see paragraphs [0013] and [0056]), and:

- an acknowledgement is received from the second synchronization device (comprising an inquiry response: see step 718 and [0057]),
- in response to receiving the acknowledgement, synchronization client is stored during the role information storing step for the first synchronization device (see step 728 and [0057]).

Regarding claim 4, the combination further shows wherein the role information is associated with the second synchronization device on the basis of the identifier (comprising the address) of the second synchronization device (see paragraph [0039]), and

the role information associated with the identifier of the second synchronization device is searched from the stored role information in the first synchronization device in response to a need to initiate a second synchronization session with the second synchronization device (see paragraph [0054]).

Regarding claim 6, the combination does not show wherein the default value of said role information is synchronization client, and the role information is not stored if synchronization client is defined as the role of the device.

However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it is notoriously old and well-known in the art to assign default values to settings, and to not store information if the default value is set. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system described in the SyncML specification to not store setting values if they are set to the default in order to conserve memory in the device.

Regarding claim 8, the combination further shows wherein storing mapping information describing the sameness of data items only on the device, the role of which is synchronization server (see the SyncML specification, section 2.3 on page 12).

Regarding claim 9, the combination further shows wherein the data being synchronized is user data (comprising a calendar: see the SyncML specification, section 2.6.2 on page 14).

Regarding claim 10, the combination further shows wherein the first synchronization device and the second synchronization device support the SyncML standard (see the SyncML specification, section 1.2 on page 7).

Regarding claim 17, the combination further shows wherein a role is selected for the first synchronization device for the second synchronization session on the basis of said role information; and the second synchronization session is initiated from the first synchronization device in accordance with the selected role (see Hillyard, paragraph [0014]).

Claims 11, 13, 16, and 23 correspond to claim 1 and are rejected for the reasons provided above.

Claims 15, 18-20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 30, and 31 correspond to claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 17 and are rejected for the reasons provided above.

Claims 2, 14, 21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the SyncML specification in view of Hillyard (US Publication No. 2003/0027526), and further in view of Wallbeck.

The combination further shows:

- wherein a client initialization message for initiating the first synchronization session is transmitted from the first synchronization device to the second synchronization device (comprising client inquiries, which are sent periodically: see Hillyard, paragraphs [0013] and [0056]);
- that errors can occur during the notification process (see Hillyard, step 720 in Fig. 7 and paragraph [0058]),
- receiving error messages when errors occur during the notification process (see the SyncML specification, item 2 on page 29),
- when establishing a server role, a server initialization message is transmitted from the first synchronization device to the second synchronization device (comprising a response to inquiry: see paragraphs [0047] and [0058]; and

- synchronization server is stored during the role information storing step as the role information for the first synchronization device (see step 740 and paragraph [0058])

The combination does not show that a server role is established upon an error. Rather, in the proposed combination, the negotiation process merely restarts (see Hillyard, Fig. 7).

Wallbeck shows establishing a server role upon an error (the error comprising that another device will not assume the necessary server role in a communication session: see paragraph [0026]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system described in the SyncML protocol to have the first device immediately assume a server role in order to save time that would otherwise be wasted on restarting the negotiation process.

Claims 5 and 27 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the SyncML specification in view of Hillyard (US Publication No. 2003/0027526), and further in view of Hawkins et al. (US Patent No. 5,884,323, hereinafter "Hawkins").

The combination does not show wherein said role information is application-specific so that separate role information is stored in the device for each application and/or application profile in the device.

Hawkins shows keeping synchronization information separate (see col. 3, lines 5-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system described in the SyncML protocol with the separate synchronization

Art Unit: 2142

information taught by Hawkins in order to prevent errors in one application's session from impacting another application's session.

Claims 7, 12, and 29 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the SyncML specification in view of Hillyard (US Publication No. 2003/0027526), and further in view of Flanagan et al. (US Patent No. 6,272,545, hereinafter "Flanagan").

The combination does not show wherein said role information is stored in a third device that is other than said first or second device.

Flanagan shows storing role information on a third device that is other than a first or second synchronization device (see col. 3, line 54-61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Chase with the off-device storage taught by Flanagan in order to relieve individual devices of the burden of storing role information.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher Biagini whose telephone number is (571) 272-9743. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Christopher Biagini
(571) 272-9743

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2142